



ms 022332

FACTS
TO KEEP
FOR
FUTURE
REFERENCE.

Ottawa
1907



SPEECH
OF
WEST HURON'S M. P.
ON
Canada's Merchant Marine
AND
Its Influence on the Price of Grain and
Help to Labor.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to inform the Prime Minister that I have consulted with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but not with the Prime Minister, with reference to the matter which I wish to bring before the House. It is a matter which I consider of sufficient importance to justify me in bringing it to the immediate attention of the House. If it is the wish of the Prime Minister that I should not go on—

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, some of my hon. friends around me seem to think that I am very anxious to go on with this matter. It is a matter which has been standing for some time, to which I have given considerable thought, and a matter of great importance and interest to the members of this House and to the people of Canada. During the last few days certain articles in the press have come to my knowledge which make it still more important that this matter should be brought to the immediate attention of the House. I ask the attention of you, Sir, and the hon. members of this House on two grounds. The first ground is that I have not trespassed on the time of this House before to any considerable length. The second ground is that the matter which I require to bring to the notice of the members of this House is one of the utmost

importance to the people of Canada. It is in reference to the merchant marine of Canada. On March 1906, the North Sydney 'Herald' had the following:

It is both commendable and practical on the part of the Halifax Board of Trade in calling attention to the surprising decension in the tonnage of vessels registered in Canada in the past thirty years of almost fifty per cent., while our water-borne commerce has increased during that time considerably over fifty per cent.; which only goes to show that Canada is losing control of one of her greatest assets. Consistent with her growth of commerce should be a proportionate increase of registered tonnage instead of the regrettable decrease. Doubtless the passing of the old-time barques and sailing ships, and their supplanting by the swifter and surer foreign steam freighter will account largely for this.

The organization within the past two years of several steamship companies in Cape Breton, and the purchase of foreign steamers is a step in the right direction, giving employment to our own Canadian seamen, and proving that it is one of the best paying investments. The profits made by foreign steamship companies on this coast, and the opportunity for employment lost to thousands of Canadian seamen is so apparent, it is surprising that this opportunity for investment has so long been overlooked.

It is generally conceded, Mr. Speaker, that maritime nations have an advantage over inland countries, and it is also conceded that no maritime nation which does not handle its own produce in its own ships can make true progress as a nation. Now, it is contended that the merchant marine of Canada, instead of increasing as it should increase, in view of our opportunities, is decreasing. There are reasons for this. I have facts which show conclusively that Canada is in a better position than almost any other nation of the globe to increase its merchant marine. I have a good case, Mr. Speaker, to lay before this House, and if you do not see it as you should, it will be solely my fault. There is no other question which affects the farmers of Canada as does the shipping question; there is no other question which so affects the labor of Canada. Canadian shipping is not linked with the transportation systems which take the produce of our farmers to foreign markets, and I contend that the missing link should be supplied by ourselves. The United States in 1810 had 100,000 tons more of foreign-going shipping than it has today. In 1838—and this is a statement which I am prepared to verify—the United States had more foreign-going steam shipping than Great Britain. This is a statement which may surprise a great many. In 1860 the United States was a close competitor with Great Britain; it carried sixty-two per cent. of its own produce. Today it car-

carries only eight per cent. Ninety-two per cent. of the exported produce of the United States is carried in foreign ships. What is the case with Canada? Our ships carry comparatively nothing.

It takes 15,000,000 tons of shipping to carry our produce for a year. And we do not carry any of it. I have the facts and figures to lay before you to show why the state of affairs is what it is and how it can be remedied. Some say that we cannot build ships here because of the high price of labor. Now, here is a statement that I wish to emphasize—that in building a ship, from the digging of the coal and ore, the making of the plates and other material, to the putting of the finished products together in the form of a ship, ninety per cent. of the cost goes to labour. I wish also to say that we here in Canada are in a better position than are any other people on earth to increase our shipping. We have an object lesson in the experience in these matters of the two great English-speaking nations, Great Britain, with very little over one thousand miles of coast line and 40,000,000 people, has one hundred large ship yards. The United States with 10,000 miles of coast line and 80,000,000 people, has only 20 large shipyards. And what is the reason? Great Britain, the great free trade country of the world, makes an exception to her free trade policy and protects her shipping, while the United States, a protective country, does not extend to her ocean shipping the protection it gives to other industries. We also are a protective country, and protect every other industry, but to shipping we afford no protection whatever. In the United States shipping on the lakes is protected. And the United States has on the lakes 55,000,000 tons of the best shipping, for the object in view, that is to be found in the world. The sailors are paid better wages than any others, and the mechanics who build the ships also receive better pay than any others of their class in the world. And, Mr. Speaker, I am a believer in high wages; I do not believe in the cry of cheap labor. And what is the result of this policy in the United States. The result is that the United States shipping on the great lakes carries freight at lower rates than prevail anywhere else in the world. Iron ore is carried a thousand miles from the end of Lake Superior to the end of Lake Erie, at from 85 cents to \$1.20 a ton. Ships trading to Sweden and sailing under the British flag carry iron ore for a thousand miles at \$2.50, that being the best rate they can give. And what is the reason? The

United States shipping on the great lakes is protected as completely as in the ocean-going shipping of Great Britain. These ships are not so much built as manufactured with a view to the special trade in which they are to engage; and by the machines which the ingenuity of our southern neighbors has enabled them to build, these ships are loaded and unloaded so quickly that they are kept constantly on the move during the season of navigation, and so they carry in nine months what it takes ocean-going ships of equal capacity twelve months to carry.

Mr. Speaker, I have many facts that I desire to bring before the attention of the House to establish my position in this matter. Speaking for the first time before this highest and greatest legislative body in the Dominion, I may not make my remarks so consecutive as they should be, but I shall be well content if I can convince this House that this matter is one of serious importance to the people of Canada. We have 2,384 miles of waterway from tide-water to the head of Lake Superior at the centre of the continent, and we own the best half of it. But we are not utilizing it. If the United States had such advantages they would certainly use them. Every dollar spent by us or by the United States in improving this great waterway means an increase in the price of the grain of the farmers of Canada. Before these improvements were started on the St. Lawrence and Welland canals it cost from 15 cents to 25 cents to carry a bushel of grain from the head of Lake Superior to Buffalo. And what does it cost today? Sometimes as low as 1½ cents. It used to cost \$13 to carry a ton of ore from Lake Superior to Lake Erie; it costs 87 cents today. But Canada has not done her share in this great development and improvement. In 1878 we had 1,333,000 tons of shipping in Canada. And, according to the last report available, that of 1904, our shipping has fallen off to 667,000 tons—not half of what it was in 1878. And of this shipping that we have, part is made up of worn out ships which we import from Europe, Sweden and other places. I protest against that. We object to diseased and worn out immigrants coming to this country. Why then should old ships be brought in to take the place of ships that should be built by our men? We have the ore, we have the coal, we have the skill, we have the brains to build ships. And if this industry is protected, I contend that we can build ships with any nation on the globe.

Where would Japan be if it were not for her ships? In

1894 Japan had 213,000 tons of shipping. Two years ago she had increased that to 913,000 tons. And how about our shipping? In 1874 we built 191,000 tons of shipping; in 1896 when this government came into power we built only 16,000 tons. I am not making a political argument out of this, you will see. And what is it today? Comparatively nothing. There were 58 ships added to the registry of Canada last year, and our tonnage increased by about 4,000 or 5,000 tons. But this was in the shape of worn out ships from abroad, tugs, dredges and other craft on the lakes. Our theory in this matter is commendable in its way; the trouble is that we begin at the wrong end. Where are the sailors to man new ships? You can make a soldier in a few hours if he knows how to sh... You can build a ship in eight months. But you cannot make a sailor in less than five years. And I contend that every sailor belonging to this country is worth double a man of any other class. He does perilous work from which other men would shrink; he must be a skilled mechanic far above the ordinary workman. But these men do not exist in sufficient numbers in Canada. And why? Because this government, like past governments, has not protected our shipping. We are in the same position with regard to shipping generally, as the United States is with regard to ocean-going shipping. Why has not the United States taken this matter up before? Simply for this reason, that although all the presidents from Washington down have advocated what President Roosevelt is advocating to-day, the voters in the interior of the country took a selfish view and did not know that they were voting against the best interests of their country. We are but 6,000,000 people here, but we may yet run a close competition with Great Britain, the great maritime nation of the world. I am an optimist, gentlemen. There are two kinds of politicians.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Several kinds.

Mr. LEWIS. There are only two to which I am going to refer. There is one who says 'I view with alarm, and one 'I point with pride.' I am one of the latter class. I can point with pride to this country and I hope to point with pride to the fact that this parliament has taken hold of the question which I now bring before it. Sir, we are in a favorable position to attain a maritime supremacy—we have the men—we inherit that from away back in the ages, to make the best seamen in the world. Why? Because we inherit the blood of

the men who manned the cutters of England in the British Channel and the luggers of France. If you take the men who sail the bankers in the maritime provinces or the Mackinaws of the great lakes, or the sealers of British Columbia, I say you cannot beat them on the face of the globe, if they have fair play. They are high-priced men, but they are worth the money. I intend to produce to you certain extracts which I have culled from certain documents and papers in reference to this matter. I have taken considerable time over this, as it is a serious matter, and I wish to place these facts on the Hansard of this house. I have here the Canadian Hand-book, issued by the Government of this country, in which it says that Canada now stands seventh on the list of maritime nations of the world. In 1874 there were ships built in Canada of a tonnage of 191,000; but in 1896 of 16,146; in 1904 total tonnage of 672,838; but in 1878 we had a total of 1,333,045.

Our average total external trade for the three years, 1901-1903, was \$425,959,428, or an increase of \$1,000,000 over the average for the preceding three years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I put these facts before you, and I wish to state to you that in the preparation of this statement I have culled over 7,000 pages of documents of the British House of Commons, of the great nation to the south of us, and of this country. I am not going to talk verbiage. I think there is too much talking in this House. I have not said very much before today because there is nothing that the farmers of this country deprecate as a lot of talk without very much being done.

With reference to the iron trade, we have nine plants making iron, in which we have \$50,000,000 invested. In British Columbia we have the coal and iron within 20 miles of each other.

The export trade of the port of Montreal in 1895 was \$40,000,000, and in 1903 it was \$105,750,000. Halifax has the finest of the many great harbors of the empire, capacious enough to afford anchorage for all the navies of Europe. Bedford basin, which has an area of nine square miles, is completely landlocked. In 1871 the total lake traffic on this side of the line was 14,283,000 tons. In 1905 there passed through the St. Mary's canal over 40,000,000 tons. Why, Sir, more traffic passes the city of Detroit and the city of Windsor in one hour than passes any other place in the world in the

same space of time. This statement may seem to some of you not acquainted with the circumstances, very startling, but it is a fact.

I am a great believer in object lessons, in comparisons, and I shall point for a moment to what has been done in another place. Here is the little republic of Argentine, away down in South America, with the city of Buenos Ayres, and what do you think they have done? They have spent \$25,000,000 on their docks and wharfs alone in that one city. The value of the produce exported is \$360,000,000 odd, and they have in that small city the finest newspaper building in the world, erected at a cost of \$2,000,000, in which 2,000 words are printed every morning, cabled from New York. But there are special difficulties there, for if an American in New York or Baltimore wants to send his goods or a letter to Buenos Ayres, what does he have to do? He has to send it via Liverpool or down by the Panama Canal to the Straits of Magellan, around the Horn and then up to Buenos Ayres. That is why I contend that our Canadian produce should be carried in Canadian ships. Besides the advantage which would accrue to Canada from the return cargoes, and the wealth which the Canadian shipowner would bring to this country, **every ship going to a foreign land will advertise our country. There is no greater factor in the promotion of foreign trade than the Canadian ship.** A Montreal man going to Winnipeg is not going to advertise Toronto goods there. If we send our freight by a foreign vessel do you mean to say that foreign vessel is going to advertise Canada, and tell where and how you can get the produce of this country? and our produce is increasing so rapidly that it is essential that we should adopt every possible means to promote our export trade. I venture to say that in five years there will not be enough grain produced in the United States to feed the people of that country. As an object lesson on that, I cite the two great states of Ohio and Illinois. In the last year, 1904-5, these great states did not **produce enough grain to feed themselves.** I have documents here to prove that assertion.

Since confederation the federal government has spent on railways \$152,000,000, besides grants of land, a total expenditure of \$1,100,000,000. We have in all 20,814 miles of railway. I contend that these railways should have their own ships, so that a man in the Northwest or elsewhere can make a through rate by one company right through to any of the great trading

posts in the world. By doing that he gets the skill and the brains and the continuity of the railway company. We should have the railway men with us in this matter, because when you have the railway men you have thousands of the cleverest and brightest men there are in Canada, whether they are constructing a line of railway in the Rockies or building a great station in the city of Ottawa.

At page 147 of the Canadian Hand-book, it says :

The commerce of Canada is largely water-borne. On the great lakes, on the Atlantic, and on the Pacific many vessels are carrying the products of the Canadian farm, forest, factory and mine to the markets of the world. Canada employs in her over-sea trade a tonnage of 15,826,705 tons of shipping.

Canada has an immense length of sea coast. The eastern coast from the Bay of Fundy to Belle Isle is 5,600 miles, while the western sea coast of British Columbia is reckoned at double that of Great Britain and Ireland. The salt water in-shores of Canada cover 15,000 square miles, not including indentations. There is a nursery for seamen for this country, and we have had the evidence of the reports of this Marine Department that these men are the best sailors on the globe.

Some two years ago I had occasion to compare the men on a Canadian steamer in the harbor of Halifax with the men on British naval ships of the North Atlantic and the West India fleet. We had there the little steamer 'Acadia' with 36 men, and in all the sports those 36 men carried off the palm. In fact the gig crew there ran away from the navies of the greatest nation in the world, although they had 2,000 to choose from. I say the sailors on the great lakes, the sailors of British Columbia and of the maritime provinces, cannot be beaten by any other sailors in the world. Take the steamship 'Canada' our only armoured cruiser, she went to the West Indies, and there, in competition with a number of fleets of other nations, our men were quicker in gun practice, quicker in rowing, quicker in everything that makes a sailor. These are facts, Mr. Speaker. The fresh water of the great lakes that belong to Canada covers 72,700 square miles, not including the waters of Manitoba and the Territories. The production of the fisheries in 1903 amounted in value to \$36,000,000. We have the waters of the Hudson's Bay, 1,000 miles long and 6,000 miles broad.

Now I sometimes talk with our cousins, the Americans south of us, who visit us yearly. We are great friends, and I

hope we always will be. I say to them you can talk about your eighty million people, but I have read the history of the past, and I have read about a great nation that came down from the north and swept everything away to the south of them. I contend we are just on the threshold of greatness. We are not at the parting of the ways, but we are like a girl who is just entering her teens, using the years as a skipping rope. Here let me quote from the London Times of February 16, 1905, the greatest paper in the world, referring to proposed United States protection law :

There should be no misunderstanding. Great Britain is shortly to be called upon to face an effort to wrest from her her commercial supremacy at sea, beyond all measure more determined and more formidable than any effort which has been made within the memory of the present generation.

That, says the London Times, of February 16, 1905. We have our share in that, Mr. Speaker, and how can we best play it? I do not wish any one to think that I am talking against imperial federation with the Old Land, but I think we can best help our mother country and best help our foster mother, France, to keep peace among nations by looking after ourselves and improving our own position. Now here is a statement from the crop report of the United States, found in No. 38 of the Congressional Records, page 3 :

No other class of producers for export has as great an interest in the problem and facilities of transportation from the farm to the primary market, and from that to the sea-coast and final markets, as the farmers have. Three-fifths exports are from farms or manufactured from farm products.

Two years ago the United States of America appointed a commission consisting of five senators and five congressmen, who went through the country looking into the merchant marine business. They took eighteen hundred pages of evidence, and here is part of it :

The merchant marine commissioners in the United States, after taking evidence from Atlantic to Pacific, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, say : Public sentiment throughout the United States is practically unanimous, not merely in desiring, but in demanding an American ocean fleet, built, owned, officered, and so far as may be, manned by our own people.

The London Times of February 16, 1905, says :

As a United States president said in his message : There is nothing more humiliating to the national pride and nothing more hurtful to our national prosperity than the inferiority of our merchant marine compared with that of other nations, whose general resources, wealth and sea-coast lines do not suggest any reason for their superiority of the sea. It was not always so, and our people are agreed, I think, that it shall not continue to be so.

Now we can take everything that is said by that report of the Merchant Marine Commissioners to ourselves, because we are in a better position than that great nation to the south of us. They are handicapped by millions of people in the interior who do not know anything about marine affairs, who do not know anything of what is going on outside of that country. That is not our case in Canada. Now why are Japan and England so far ahead? Because they have a large maritime community; they have not so many people in the interior, not so many voters who will overrule those on the coast who are seeking what is best for the country. I will cite a case to show that the best men in the United States advocate what I am advocating today. I am not moving any resolution, I am just bringing these facts before the House. Here is another quotation from the London Times:

With the question of freights and trade routes is inseparably bound up the question of financial exchange.

Rightly, or wrongly, the belief in America today is that Great Britain holds her commercial position, not by virtue of her present ability or manufacturing industry, but by reason of her position, won for her by a generation that has gone, as the "carrier and broker of the world." It is, they believe, on her accumulated capital in money and ships that she is living today, by the leverage that those ships give her, in securing foreign trade, and by the toll which she levies on freights and exchange on the business of other nations.

Now I quote from page 239 of the American Merchant Shipping Report:

This industry calls for products of and furnishes employments to nearly every other industry in the country. If others can carry freight cheap is it not better to let them do it?

Here I quote again from page 243 of that report:

Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Jackson said no. England has said no for 300 years. Bismarck said no. We are far better suited for a shipping nation than Germany. It is for the ultimate good of all.

That is the policy of Bismarck laid down years ago and is now bearing fruit in the German nation. I quote again from page 246 of the Merchant Marine:

Some one said we did not know how to build vessels. Look at the United States fleet on great lakes. One million tons of specially built craft that carry freight cheaper than any other water craft afloat, and still the crews are paid higher wages and fed better than any ships afloat. We have eight thousand vessels less than in 1868, water craft afloat, and still the crews are paid to other countries (how many millions?) and which if we did our own freighting would be spent at home, are still large considerations.

I contend that every ship that leaves our shore is like a delivery wagon leaving a store. If a store in Ottawa, Montreal or Toronto starts employing the wagon of another store to deliver its goods, you know what the result will be after a while. Let us send our own produce in our own ships, Canadian ships built by Canadian labor, out of Canadian materials, manned by Canadian sailors, and the money will be returned, every dollar of it, into the coffers of our own people. The encouragement of our own navigation has at all times been important.

It is incumbent on us to consider by what mode our commerce and agriculture can be best relieved from an injurious dependance on the navigation of other nations.

England has a potential tonnage of 36,000,000, or more than one-half that of the entire world; Germany, 7,000,000. England leads as she has done for a century. Howe in Encyclopædia Brit., Vol. 21, page 827, ed. of '88, says that the ships of Italy excelled in the middle ages. In the 16th century Spain was ahead, but Elizabeth and Charles offered bounties for the building of large ships; preference was given to English ships; English built and English manned. In 1830, England had 2,199,959 tons and the United States, 1,191,776 tons. England today receives \$380,000,000 as her share for carrying the world's goods. She has to build 800,000 tons every year, not counting ships built for foreigners, equal to \$100,000,000 in construction expenses alone. Before I go any further I wish to state in advocating the payment of bounties to ships, I also advocate that our waterways be increased and improved. There has been a proposal that we should make a 22 or 20 foot water way from salt water to the great lakes. It has been said that ships going from the head of Lake Superior to foreign countries would simply make Montreal a place of passage. That is not correct. Lake shipping is of no use to the ocean. It will carry grain, ore and coal cheaper than the shipping of any nation in the world, because our lake vessels have been built especially for that purpose. These are a hull of steel hoppers with sometimes as many as forty hatches, separated only by a narrow beam sufficient for strength and the bottom of the vessel is built out to form the hopper. This is not a ship; it is simply designed to carry grain and cargo on the great lakes. In August of last year a gentleman at Sault Ste. Marie made the statement that the American ship had got to be so strong that it could stand any storm. But, shortly af-

terwards that was proved not to be the case. Last fall, unfortunately for the poor men who were in charge, a number of these steel ships were cast upon the rocks in Lake Superior, and a great many lives and millions of dollars were lost simply because the boats were not loaded and prepared for stormy weather. They have to be loaded and looked after specially to withstand bad weather. These boats would be no use on the ocean. They can carry grain to tide water, they can carry coal back and they can carry ore, but they cannot carry cargo across the Atlantic. What is wanted on the Atlantic is a boat that will carry from 20,000 to 30,000 tons. I have here a statement taken from the official records of the American Mercantile Marine Commission, showing the purposes of the movement re ships.

1. To aid in a practical way. To bring our own foreign trade into our own hands and thus save to our citizens the millions of dollars paid by our citizens to increase the wealth of others. (United States freight yearly over \$200,000,000.)

2. To increase the exportation and sale of our rapidly increasing productions in the great markets of Africa and Eastern Asia. This trade will go to the country that has its own ships and postal and commercial agencies.

3. To increase the number of that highly skilled and valuable class of citizens, the "mariners." It will take considerable time to do this, but the sooner we begin the sooner and easier will be its accomplishment. All our citizens will benefit by this. Any measure or movement which tends to increase our exports and augment our foreign trade and build up our depleting merchant marine is worthy of the most serious, painstaking and patriotic consideration of every citizen.

Mr. Wm. Livingston says :

Not one appropriation of the United States has resulted in net results so great as that for harbor and river expenditures. I know of nothing on the face of the earth that will accomplish so much good, that will benefit so greatly the nation and all the inhabitants of the United States, as to devise some means by which the United States flag can be found in every port on this round globe.

Instead of inserting in there the United States flag, I would put in the Canadian flag. Mr. Wm. Bird, testifying before the American Merchant Marine Commission, said :

Exporting, etc, 66 years, trade follows the flag. No amount of effort by mails or through salesmen is as efficient as ship.

Mr. J. K. Oldham says :

The British sea-going screw steamship has been the means of largely increasing British export trade by placing British machinery and other products cheaply and quickly in foreign markets. It has increased Britain's commercial connections in all parts of the world to an extent that could only have been accomplished by ships of her own country.

Mr. George D. Grey, San Francisco, says :

While the operations of marine are only seen upon the boundaries of our country, it is beneficial to all, or otherwise. A blow upon any part of the body is felt all over ; so a blow to our merchant marine reaches in a more or less degree to every hamlet and township in the land.

Mr. John D. Farquhar, of Buffalo, who is the originator of a Bill, says :

It is a commercial question and a national question. It involves our well being, and may involve our national existence some day. It is nation against nation, fighting for commerce of the sea. We are in a position as a steel manufacturing country to build ships.

I contend that these words should apply to Canada. The London Times contained the following :

The way to get the trade of any country, said Mr. Blaine, is to send our own ships there to fetch it. Our ships and seamen, our merchants and mechanics, our labor and capital should be employed to earn out our own commerce. These treasures, as precious as they are simple, should not be destroyed. If wisely cherished they will always furnish indisputable evidence of our greatness. They are essential to our power. These truths are self-evident, and I wish to say to you and impress on you that this question is wider and greater than any other problem before the people today. When you take into account the small pittance ships have received from the American Government compared to what railroads have received, it alone is enough to set people thinking.

I apply that to Canada just as much as it applies to the United States :

Admiral Harrington, of the United States Navy, writes :

Trade is a natural condition of human life, and trade is an essential element of national greatness. Our exchange with foreign countries forms the true cause and measure of our prosperity alike in the products of the soil, mines, manufactures and science.

The Hon. R. G. Bickford says :

Proximity to the sea and dependence upon it have their natural effect upon shipping ; when these conditions concur unless retarded by ill-considered legislation the marine progress of such a people is assured, and when under these conditions wise and provident laws exist, progress will be repaid.

In the year 1582 there were 186 English ships, but that far-seeing woman, Queen Elizabeth, put on discriminating duties, and in ten years the number of British ships was trebled. Adam Smith, in his "Wealth of Nations," says :

English navigation laws are unpopular among nations, but they are the wisest of all the commercial regulations of England.

It is also stated that the growth of a great carrier nation cannot but result in giving such a nation a disproportionate in-

fluence among the nations of the earth. Mr. Tyson, of Savannah, Georgia, made the statement that United States merchant shipping was handicapped by political jealousy at Washington. I cite that statement to show that this is a national and not a political question, and that we should all combine together for the good of Canada. It is also said that cheap labor makes a difference in cost, and we do not want cheap labor here. Mr. Wright, of Galveston, Texas, says :

Let each nation bring in its own imports free, but tax all nations to carry other nations' imports.

Just here let me ask why should Norway and Sweden come over here and bring their ships into our ports where the British load line and navigation laws prevail, and which prevent our ships carrying as large a cargo as the Norwegian ships do. Why should not every ship that comes to a Canadian port be subject to our law? Why should we not put a discriminating duty on every pound of freight that comes here from any other nation and which is not carried in that nation's ships. Mr. Porch, of Galveston, says :

The Atlantic ocean, rolling between two mighty hemispheres, is a German, French, and English sea, but the Pacific, with twice the area of water, washing the shores of two nations containing two-thirds the population of the globe, is henceforth to be an American sea, covered with American ships and laden with the products of American industry.

The commerce of half the world, realizing the dream of Columbus, will go westward to the Indies.

Why should we not say that the Pacific is a Canadian sea? We are nearer to China, we are nearer to Japan, we have the coast line, we have the iron, we have the coal and we have the men, and I am glad to say our capitalists have the money ; we have all the advantages and why should we not say that the Pacific ocean is a Canadian sea; that we should carry our own products in our own ships, and then half the commerce of the world, realizing the dream of Columbus, will go westward to the Indies, and go in Canadian ships. We all know that at the time of the Spanish war the United States took over the Philippines, Porto Rico, Hawaii and Cuba, and prevented foreign shipping from carrying goods to these countries, thus giving an advantage to American ships. In five years the Philippine trade increased from nothing to five millions of dollars; Porto Rico increased from nine millions to fourteen millions; Hawaii increased from four millions to eleven millions, and Cuba from seven and one-third millions to twenty-one millions. I would ask the Minister of Customs to

take a note of that. These are facts pregnant with great possibilities. The total United States exports of domestic manufactures increased from \$228,000,000 to \$407,000,000 yearly, and during the past five years United States tonnage on the lakes increased 570,600 yearly, and yet Canada has gone back. United States report says:

It is well known that British colonies have possible capacity to produce a very large part of such articles as may be needed by Great Britain. Trade once lost to us and gained by Canada cannot be regained by us except at a tremendous disadvantage and sacrifice with consequent suffering and trouble in American agricultural states.

And here is a statement from the London Times of Feb. 16, 1905, which is of the utmost importance to our national welfare. It says:

While in every other direction, in population, in wealth, in power and in size, we are growing in all but our marine interests which are going down.

For the first time in United States history, no square rigged vessel for deep sea trade was launched on either Atlantic or Pacific coast line, and only one steamer for foreign trade under construction in United States shipyards. United States shipyards have not received an order for a steamship for foreign trade since 1901.

President Arthur said, as quoted in the article of the London Times:

With no United States steamers on principal ocean lines or in any foreign ports, our facilities for extending our commerce are greatly restricted, while the nations which build and sail ships and carry the passengers and mails, obtain thereby conspicuous advantages, increasing their trade. More recently President Roosevelt said the same thing in a characteristic way: Ships work for their own country just as railways work for their terminal points.

The way to get the trade of any country is to send our ships there to fetch it.

Mr. John Craig, a gentleman whom I have met and who was formerly established at Trenton, and has now one of the largest ship building yards in the United States, said in his sworn evidence:

I say to you that if the opportunity is given to the shipbuilding interests in this country with its soil and climate, with such a people as we have here, with their birth, their habits, their ambitions and their opportunities, and we have as bright men here as anywhere in the world, in ten years we will build ships for England as we did years ago.

Formerly every farmer on the navigable waters in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was engaged at ship building in the winter time, and I want to know why it is that they are not engaged in that business today?

James W. Porch, of New Orleans, said:

Steamers chartered by those at a distance and sent here to be loaded with cargoes because it is cheaper, do not materially add to our upbuilding. Our best interests can be handled and developed best by those whose interests are identical with our own. Foreign aid should not be called on to carry the result of our brain and brawn.

Ships of 6000 to 7000 tons dead weight are best for present investment.

It takes from 5 to 10 years to put any new trade on a paying basis. Our ships should be on an equality, if not preferred. Put a duty on all transports not carried in our own ships.

England limits the subsidy to ships built in British yards—this is new—because she is afraid of Germany.

England has paid \$250,000,000 of subsidies; that is the way she protects her shipping. Formerly she gave a subsidy to ships sailing under the British flag, now it is limited to ships built in British yards. Mr. Porch said further:

The English navigation law was a great protective measure and was an immense success.

Capt. Mahan says: "A ship becomes a sort of commercial traveller for whatever country it belongs to."

We must first get the ships and acquire the shipbuilding habit. Then other matters will right themselves.

Von Humboldt's famous conclusion was: That contact with the ocean has been one of the chief influences in forming the character of nations, as well as adding to their wealth and power.

The absolute argument for the protection of the great lakes is that United States shipping is absolutely protected there, and the rates are the lowest in the world, and the men are better fed and paid than in any other industry.

Here is an answer one of the Prime Ministers of England sent to the British Minister in Belgium:

In matters of commerce the fault of the Dutch is giving too little and asking too much. With equal advantage the Swedes are content. So we'll clap on Dutch bottoms 20 per cent.

It is not to moderation of justice of others we trust for a fair and equal access to markets for our own products, or for our due share in carrying our own, but to our own means of independence and business get-up.

There is another matter of serious moment which I wish to bring to the attention of this House, but before I go into that I wish to quote some extracts from an article which was quoted at the half Centennial of the Sault canal on the great lakes, by William Livingstone:

In an address delivered by Henry Clay to Lafayette, in Washington December 10, 1824, on the occasion of Lafayette's last visit to America, Mr. Clay opposed the canal, Mr. Livingstone used the following language:

The vain wish has sometimes been indulged that providence would allow the patriot after death to return to his country to contemplate the intermediate changes which had taken place; to view the forests felled, the cities built, the mountains levelled, the canals cut, the high ways constructed, the progress of the arts, the advancement of learning, and the increase of population. Could he stand here today and witness the celebration, view this beautiful city, with its many industries, happy homes, progressive people, and the city but yet in its infancy, and destined to be beyond a doubt, with its great natural advantages, one of the great cities of this nation, and when comparing the present with his prediction of sixty-two years ago, who could paint the emotions which would surge through his brain?

A short review of lake navigation, the subject on which I am to speak, reveals a transformation scene even greater. While statistics are necessarily dry, it is an absolute necessity to use a few of them in showing and demonstrating the tremendous increase in the tonnage of the great lakes during the past fifty years. In 1844, fifty years ago, the total tonnage of Lake Superior, not only the cargo, but the ships that carried it as well, could be stowed away comfortably in the hold of any of the largest modern steamers that have come into commission during the past year, and that are daily passing through the canal.

The tonnage of the Detroit river is equal to five times the foreign tonnage of New York harbor, and greater than the combined tonnage of Liverpool, London and Hamburg, and with tonnage to spare in addition. And it must also be borne in mind in connection with this, that our season of navigation on the great lake is 230 days, whereas on the seaboard they have the entire 365 days. In no other place in the world can so animated water view be obtained as the Detroit river. It is a constant procession, ships never out of sight.

The progress in the loading and unloading facilities of our vessels has increased in equal proportion. In the inception of the ore trade it was put aboard little schooners by hand labor of severest sort, and at a cost per ton that would today be fabulous. It took about four days to load a cargo of 300 tons, and the unloading of the cargo was an even greater undertaking. To get a cargo out of the hold staging had to be built. The ore was shovelled upon this staging, then from the staging to the deck, and then from the deck to the dock, making three handlings in all. By this process it took nearly a week to unload 300 tons, and the next move was by means of block, tackle and a horse. Only a few days ago the steamer G. W. Perkins unloaded 10,514 gross tons of ore in four hours and ten minutes, with only 33 men, the bulk of this being unloaded by clam shells. This is over 50 tons per minute and 1,800 pounds per second, and is equal to 260 cars of 40 tons capacity, making six trains of 40 cars each. Ten years ago this would have been shovelled into buckets, taking a number of days, and there is not a dock on the coast today could unload this cargo in a week.

Our waterways have acted as a most powerful regulator of rates. When it is considered that a diminution of one mill per ton on the railroads of the country effects a saving of nearly eight hundred millions to the shippers of transportation, the value of this restrictive power can not be overestimated. And as Prof. Lewis M. Haupt stated in a paper recently at a meeting of the American Philosophical Society, held in Philadelphia, that had the distribution of the railroads been regulated by fact such regulation by water does not reduce but greatly increases the revenues of the railroads, he would have but emphasized the commercial paradox which comparatively few persons appear to recognize.

As far as I understand it, the reason is the cheaper water transportation. As coarse freight, such as the grain of the farmers and the ore of the mines, is more and more carried by water, the first class of freight which is carried by the railways, and from which they make their money increases also. Consequently, by deepening our canals and enlarging our waterways, we increase the earning powers of the railways at the same time.

Another matter on which there has been a considerable discussion, is the load line. This is a serious matter. For a number of years there have been very few wooden ships built in Canada. But some owner of a factory or moneyed man takes small wooden vessels, cuts the masts out of them, and converts them into barges, and then sends them out with a tug, with men in them, in many cases to be drowned like rats in a barrel. Our best ships are inspected, and their officers, engineers, captains and mates require certificates; but barges are not inspected, and the men who go out in them do not require certificates. This is an outrage, not on the government, or on us, but on the whole country. The result is that many a fine seaman is lost, and no one knows the reason.

I am not going to refer to any case in point on the side of the line, for that might lead us into a discussion of other matters. But there are cases on the other side of the line that I can give. A boat will go out of harbor with four barges, the boat herself 150 feet in length and each of the barges from 200 to 220 feet, and floating 200 fathoms apart. That is to say, five or six vessels will make a tow, with a length of from a mile to a mile and a half. That length is dangerous to the finest ships, and yet these vessels will go out to face the dangers of these thickly studded waters and add to them. Let a storm come up, and the captain cannot see even the first ship behind him, and the whole tow becomes completely unmanageable. These ships should be absolutely prohibited from going out on the lakes except in June or July. There should be a load line, and our shipping should be protected on the Maritime Province coast, because the lack of that protection is killing a great industry. Foreign built ships carry the traffic between our ports and foreign ports; but in Nova Scotia they are still building small ships to carry produce in a small way between ports that the large vessels cannot enter. These small vessels should be protected from the grasping monopoly to which I have referred. The Americans are in the same position that we are in. Why

did our shipping disappear in 1878? It was because of the Plimsoll Act. To prevent the vessels coming under the operation of this Act, this owners transferred them, so that they would be registered under the flag of Norway and Sweden. Under that registry they have rights in our ports that they ought not to have. This national load line is a sinking line, not a floating line. This is not a party question. South and east and west and north are interested. Put our seamen on an equal footing with others, and they can compete with any. Dr. Smith, the United States agent to Japan, says that the prowess of Japan is due in no small degree to the skill, bravery and loyalty of her fishermen. And that applies with even greater force to the fishermen of Canada. Dr. Smith says that the unit of Russian ship companies are brave, but, as a rule, they are wanting in high sea experience, and in that elasticity that enables British and American seamen to adapt themselves to new and difficult responsibilities as they arise. And the Toronto News of December 2, 1905, says—and I suppose there are other similar items in other papers, but I quote what happened to come under my own eyes:

Year after year brings its tale of disasters on the lakes, caused by sending out overloaded and undermanned vessels in the stormy weather of November and December. The lives of sailors are sacrificed, not to necessity but to pure greed.

The sailors want the Plimsoll line and "watch and watch outside." That means that, while outside of port, the sailors should have watch and watch about. This should be fixed by law. Remember, I am talking about the sailors and not about the masters and mates. The sailor is liable to be called up at any hour of the night—storms generally occur at night. His watch, including the dog watch, will make fourteen hours one day and ten the next. He has his four hours off at night. The rule now is to turn him out at eight bells in the morning and to keep him on deck all day, even though he may not be required to assist in navigating the ship. The starboard watch should have the right to be below when not absolutely needed for the navigation of the ship, while the port watch is on deck. There is another contention which the Americans strongly make as shown by the report I have referred to. They say: Stop worn out vessels being brought here. You stop, or should stop, diseased immigrants. Keep out diseased ships and help our own labor. You compel a first class steamer with powerful engines and all that to have captains, mates and engineers all certificated and inspected yearly. Why, a law is a

farce that lets a rotten hulk to be made into a tow barge, overloaded, undermanned, neither officer nor boat inspected.

There should be a Plimsoll line for vessels on the lakes. Vessels would be preserved, and what is far better, the seamen would be preserved. Page 281 of the report says:

Is the sailor not entitled to consideration. To whose fidelity, staunch and steadfast courage and heroism do you confide your lives when on the deep? Who cares for you, your son and daughter, when on a voyage through darkness, storms, collisions, wrecks, and, most dreaded of all, fire at sea. Even now they ask for no charity, they only want a chance to work—to get work at fair wages and live on their own earnings.

Now, here is a point to which I ask special attention. Felix Foley said under oath. "There is no Plimsoll line in the United States." He added: "When the water is coming in the scuppers on deck she is loaded, that is well understood on the American coast." Let me explain what that means. A one-deck vessel has bulwarks, and the scuppers are little doors above the deck and level with it, and opening outwards. When the vessel is so deeply laden that the water comes in at these scuppers, then she is considered to be loaded. At page 1703 of the report of the American Merchant Marine Commission evidence is given of a 1,500-ton coal vessel on the Atlantic coast with only four men before the mast; and at page 1705 it is testified that some times there are only two or three men, all green and cheap. Why the number of men per ton should be fixed by law, and undermanned vessels should not be allowed to go to sea at all. The report that I have quoted, page 1706, shows that no industry pays as much to labor as shipbuilding does. The laborer, the mechanic, the farmer, the merchant all benefit. The revival of shipping will benefit the whole country. First by the employment of mechanics and laborers in the shipyards, and second by the employment of these classes in rolling mills, lumber mills, coal fields and factories. And we in Canada can furnish everything that goes into the construction of vessels. Mr. Gorman, whose evidence is to be found at page 1709 of the report referred to, speaks of a vessel of 200 tons, of Rock and, Maine, manned by a captain, cook and two men. Consequently there was only one man on deck at a time and the time at the wheel was four hours. No lookout was kept. At page 1717, Mr W.B. Barton, of New York, says that an American schooner loads the scuppers down to the water nine times out of ten. These vessels are also undermanned, and in a gale heave and toss; they are clumsy and awkward and with the strain to which they are subjected are very apt to spring a leak. Here

are two instances that are referred to—the wreck of the Mears and the Midnight, towed by the steam barge Wilhelm. The wreck occurred on November 27, 1889, on Lake Huron, in a blinding snowstorm and northeast gale. All hands perished. The cargo in these cases was lumber. On January 25, 1905, the Sea King lost four barges out of a tow of five, loaded with coal. All hands were lost. The barges were all insured. On September 30, 1896, the Sumatra, in tow of the B. W. Arnold, and loaded with coal, was lost off Milwaukee—all hands lost. From 1890 to 1903, 472 barges were wrecked, with a loss of 118 lives. The causes were overloading and undermanning. The fault was altogether with the seamen, although these were as a rule men picked up anywhere and engaged at from \$14 to \$16 per month. At page 61 of the report it is stated that tows are dangerous to sailing vessels. Tows are sometimes a mile long. If the law can make vessels burn green and red lights and otherwise direct details of navigation, then it can limit the length of tows.

The law says there must be certain whistles, one long and two short, when a vessel is going in a fog with a tow, but there is nothing as to the length of the tow, which may be 300 feet or 6,000 feet.

Then he says :

Seamen should be placed on the same level as our skilled mechanics on shore.

Seamen should have watch and watch day and night, one day, ten hours, the next 14. This will not hurt the ship, it will improve and better the condition of everybody, both officers, men and owners.

Standard of efficiency. Deck hands should not be allowed to ship as able seamen.

I cite this one case, the case of the Rio, which was lost in San Francisco bay, with great loss of life.

Now if you recall this was a large ocean steamer coming in from the Pacific ocean, with a great many people on board. She was going through the Golden Gate, there was a little fog and no sea whatever. She ran on a rock and there was an enormous loss of life, although it was 20 minutes after she struck before she sank. What was the reason? Because the crew were Chinese cheap labor. Here is another case, the Queen, a large ship with a crew and passengers. She caught fire in a heavy sea, but very few were lost and the ship was eventually saved. Why? Because the crew were good Anglo Saxon seamen, A. B.'s every one of them. These are two cases which

speaking for themselves. In the interest of human life, in the interest of property, in the interest of our working people, we think that men who ship as seamen, to do seamen's work, should be seamen, and that the Government of this country should see that they are.

Now here is the English House of Commons Report, a very recent report, (1901). Mr. Arthur Norman Hill, not the great J. J. Hill, whom I shall quote later, but an English authority, at page 121 says :

If you put restrictions on foreign traders, and they keep away or retaliate, we have enough ships to do the business.

That is speaking of British business.

What the British ship wants is a fair field. Then we are able to fight and will fight.

Load Line Act is a good Act, but shipping regulations are fifty years old and want overhauling. For instance, Merchants' Shipping Act of 1854 requires ocean vessels to carry salt for 70 days.

This is one reason why we should overhaul our Shipping Act. Mr. Hill, at page 122, says that in England if a vessel is lost, the owner is responsible for a part of the cargo. In Germany it is different in cases of overloading or collisions. The German says take the ship. Colonies enforce regulations against British but not against foreign vessels. Mr Hill says that subsidies are a last resort, but there are many cases of new trade routes where it is absolutely necessary to give subsidies to start trade until it has been worked to pay.

Great Britain has a complete system of training lads for sea. The German Government assists the Hamburg-American line in maintaining two large sailing vessels that seek trade all over the world and carry a large number of apprentice boys. At page 22 it says :

Vessels are nurseries for seamen. They are the pioneers of commerce visiting new ports where trade is too small or channel too shallow for a steamer. Cheapest carriers of certain important cargoes, and their presence is everywhere a check upon exorbitant steam rates. Steamers do not produce sailors in the strict sense of the word, men who not only have sea habit steps, but skill in all exigencies, contempt for danger, self-reliance under difficulties and adaptability to all sorts of conditions of circumstances, sea-found men, resourceful under any of the thousand liabilities of a sea life.

When we have the ships we will have the sailors. There is no country in the world that is better able to give our boys a chance in the merchant marine than we should be able to do.

I shall now refer to some American evidence. Mr. Harry Coulby, of the Pittsburg Steamship Company, said that this is the most vital issue before the people today. There were 292 ships passing Suez and only one United States flag which beat 16 to 1 all hollow. He said that the merchant marine is sick. He said also that transportation which connects producer and consumer and which is the very life blood of commerce, is a science pure and simple, and nowhere is carried out more scientifically than on United States lake side. He said: Let all the people contribute something for the good of all the people; this is an economic, not a political question. Mr. Julius Blever spoke of the steamer Augustus B. Wolvin, which is 560 feet long, and which carried up the lake 10,500 tons of coal, and brought down 12,289 tons of ore to Chicago. The Wolvin has 33 hatches and is practically one long steel hopper, built to suit the sweep of dredge scoops for discharging. She and other ships of the same class can carry cargo cheaper than any other vessels in the world, because she has practically a long steel hopper with 33 hatches, built so that one man can get out from her 3,000 tons an hour. She can do that on the lakes, but she cannot on the ocean, so that Montreal and Quebec should be one on this. In 1903, 18,526 vessels, carrying 34,674,437 tons of freight, passed through the St. Mary's canal, and I understand that this year there were ten million tons more.

Mr. David Vance, one of the most experienced men on the great lakes, says that every dollar spent in improving the great lakes waterways has benefitted the people of the West, reducing freight 20 cents to one cent per bushel. Ship building and ocean freighting, he said, are domestic industries as much as wheat raising and manufacturing.

Mr. Baker, of Baltimore, said there never was a more opportune time for any country to assist its merchant marine than at the present moment. Ship yards and ship-builders need some help to start. New ship lines, skin-resistance, and flat bottoms were best. A ship twenty years old could not compete with the ship of today. Steel outlasts iron, the latter is thicker and heavier. Steel was suitable for the North Atlantic and cheaper than iron. He said that \$2,500,000 a year for 20 years would put the United States away ahead in the way of ordinary merchant marine, and in carrying United States products.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if \$2,500,000 would do that in the United States, much less than half of that would do it in Canada.

Mr. Baker also said that to cheapen transportation you have to keep up with modern construction. If our ocean transportation could be carried in 20,000 ton ships it could be done for 20 per cent. less.

It is probably not known to a great many in this House that no ship ever crosses the Atlantic that takes such a quantity of grain as has been brought into the port of Midland by one ship. The biggest cargo that sails out of Quebec would average 125,000 bushels of wheat, but Midland takes in 216,000. A forwarder took me to task when I told him that a vessel had gone out of Fort William with 350,000 bushels of grain. He laughed at me and said it was an absurdity. This has been exceeded.

Now the reason the Americans can make freights cheaper is because, instead of spending three or four days or a week loading or unloading, they say that the ship is not earning money unless she is at sea, and so they have put all their skill and ingenuity to provide that she should not remain more than one day at a dock. To cheapen transportation you have to keep your vessel going.

Orient business should belong to the United States.

I say it should not, it should belong to Canada, we are nearest.

Price of material that goes into a ship is the small end of the constructive cost. It is cost of operating plant and cost of labor that must be mainly considered.

We have all the talent and natural energy to obtain our share of carrying trade of the world, if this energy can be directed into a proper channel, but we must first put our own ships and mercantile interests upon equal footing with other carrying nations of the world. It must be made possible for a man to build a ship and come out even. It must be made possible for a man to own a ship and come out even.

The issue I lay before you is one between foreign and outside and American labor.

In September, 1903, Mr. Prentice, of Cleveland, went around the world to find the American flag and a whale. He says: I saw the whale, but I have been around the world three times and never saw an American flag.

In 1903 South America used \$800,000,000 gold or farm products, all from Europe.

You must nurse an infant for a few years.

We have an infant here, and we have another infant started in the town of Welland; the town of Welland paid some thousands of dollars for a site for another steel factory. We have a thousand men employed in Collingwood building large ships, we

should have 10,000 men there. That is an infant which we should nourish. Here is another evidence on page 1870 :

English boat same trip in twelve months as lake boat in seven months. Banks will loan to build ships if Government protects them. Ore for centuries must be carried down the lakes.

On that point there is some question as to whether we have ore in this country. We have ore, according to the Canadian Hand-book. But irrespective of that, if there is no tariff on ore, we can buy it from the United States and we can bring it on Lake Superior. England has to get her ore from Sweden, a thousand miles away, at a cost of \$2.50 a ton. We could bring it from Sweden to this country in ships just as cheaply as England does, if we carried it in our own ships.

Measures which have for aim upbuilding of industries of the country should appeal to great body of citizens regardless of party. Every single industry within our national jurisdiction have received concerted aid of whole nation, except ships

The interests of the whole country, the enlargement of foreign markets for our surplus products of the farm, the increased work in the mine, factory, ship and boiler shop for labor, and the training of able seamen will all be promoted by the restoration of our merchant marine. An enlightened policy through which we would find an ample reward in the increase of our commerce, and in making our country more favorably known abroad.

Now I will quote from Mr. James J. Hill. I am glad to say that Mr. Hill is reconsidering his opinion of this country, where he was born, because I see he is going to build another trans-continental line in three years. I am glad of it, the more railways we have in the West the better :

Our public domain is gone. Today people by tens of thousands are leaving their own country and going to the country where I was born, Canada. They do not want to go, but people flock into Canada from Iowa, South Minnesota, South Dakota, and often from Nebraska, Kansas, Michigan and Wisconsin. Reason : they often sell their land at from \$60 to \$75 per acre, and buy equally as good at \$6 or \$8 per acre. I think the agricultural portion of our nation has always been its sheet anchor, and I think it always will be. I think it has its full share of intelligence and patriotism and every thing that goes to make good citizenship. A man loves a little money and wants to buy a farm and sit under his own fig tree.

I will now quote from a great Canadian, since passed away, the Hon. Joseph Howe. We know how when he appeared in the great reciprocity convention held many years ago in the city of Detroit, he stood out prominently among all the prominent gentlemen there. He was a man amongst ten thousand, there were few who could compete with him on this continent. On : 730, the Hon. Joseph Howe said :

You don't know your resources. Your debt will fade away in the presence of the great resources which you have. And fifteen years afterwards he said he had lived to see his words realized.

I say, Sir, that if we have to go to England or to the continent to borrow money for this purpose we should do it. We do not know our resources. It will cost us very little. It will be like a farmer who has to take the products of his farm away and has no wagon of his own to do it with. Do you mean to say he is going to leave them there, or let his neighbor come along and carry them and make money out of them? No, he will borrow a little money and buy a wagon, and make more money in carrying his products himself and get a bigger price. We all know that no man can attend to his business as well as he can himself.

Page 38. Canadian Handbook.

Assets of Canadian lands, if sold at \$1 per acre, would pay the national debt.

Public buildings, canals, public railroads, and lands are not placed against public debt.

Coal, Alberta, varies from high grade lynite to highest anthracite, supply inexhaustible.

Page 55. Great industry of Canada is agriculture. It employs more people and has a greater output than all others. Nature has marked Canada for greatest agricultural country of the world, vast expanse of country, fertility of soil, rain of summer, and snow and frost of winter, and all climatic conditions are peculiarly favorable to the largest possible production of grains, roots and fruits.

Bismarck inaugurated the German policy, and the present Kaiser is carrying it out. In other words the present Emperor is a far-seeing and wise man, and he knows a good procedure when he sees it.

Mr. Thayer says :

Repairs on steamships alone is a large industry. No ship can survive twenty years without a bill of repairs much over her original cost.

Mr. Thayer also says :

England is free trade on land and protectionist on sea.

The report of the Secretary of the Navy of the United States says :

It requires much more time to produce a marine officer than it does to produce a ship.

In Bullen's "Men of the Merchant Service" we find this statement :

An able seaman properly so called is a skilled mechanic with great abilities.

Mr. A. Chesbrough says :

Decay of shipping is harder on the masses than on the classes, but it knows no distinction in its influence. It penetrates the nation.

Mr. W. H. Seward said 50 years ago :

The Pacific ocean, with its shores, its islands and the vast region beyond will become the chief theatre of events in the world's great hereafter.

I am speaking not solely for the great riding of West Huron, to which I belong, because I believe that the people in sending me here to represent the people of West Huron, sent me here to represent Canada. What benefits Canada will benefit West Huron.

Mr. W. M. Killingsworth, Oregon, U. S., says :

Pacific coast is no longer our back door, it's another front door. Business is a warfare without blood. We must use a proper gun. When our people realize that sailors are not made like soldiers. It takes time to become familiar with the roll of ocean waves. We must look at this matter in a national, not a provincial spirit. Young men go to sea in preference to offices and stores.

In my early days, when the spring time came, we had an exodus from our town to the water. There is very little chance now for our boys to go sailing because there are no boats.

Mr. James Rolph, Jr., Pacific Coast, says :

Commercial supremacy of England has been maintained for many years through her shipping and the knowledge which the leading minds of England have of the law of commerce and the law of trade, the necessities of the marine have resulted in the protection of vessels carrying the flag.

I am now going to quote Mr. August D. Wolvin, the man who started the trade from the west end of Lake Superior to Quebec, he said :

The export is going to turn largely through the St. Lawrence if the Dominion Government opens the channel.

The people of Sweden said : If you do not take our boats we will put them over there. There is nothing to prevent them coming in here and carrying the grain from Fort William to Quebec. The Swedes have 400 little boats that will go through our canals, they have cheap labor, they have no Plimsoll line, and they have cheap food that we do not want in this country. Mr. Wolvin says :

I do not believe there is any line of traffic by which the exports from the lake country can be carried to any better advantage than down the St. Lawrence. It is hard to be brought to that conclusion, but after wrestling awhile

with the question I am convinced that it is so. All year there was no mishap except to one tow barge. Insurance on the St. Lawrence is three-eighths per cent, higher than on the lakes, but as compared with the value of the commodity it is small.

In 1838, United States steam vessels represented 193,432 tons, and Great Britain 74,684 tons. In 1860, United States 867,937 tons, and Great Britain 452,320. Almost incredible; I could hardly believe it when I looked at the book. But what then appears? Great Britain then began to protect her interests. The United States were prevented by political jealousies at Washington. Mr. F. M. Todd, of San Francisco, says:

It takes more men to work a ship and handle her freight than it does to build her. When a ship is launched that only begins her expense account. Her owner likes to see her and repair her at home, and in a ship life there must be repairs. Her arrival provides work for pilot, tug, watchman, stevedores, freight clerks, teamsters, commission men, shipwrights, riggers, caulkers, for sail, block and spar, manufacturers, machinery men and boiler shops, dry docks, painters, grocers, boarding houses, etc.

Capt. I. E. Thayer says:

I began in 1855, the palmy days of United States shipping, when to be a shipowner, a master, a shipbuilder, even a boy on a fishing schooner was a matter of pride. I often paused from my work to watch the launching of the finest specimen of marine architecture the world has ever seen.
——the tea clippers of Baltimore.

The celebrated clipper ships of the day, created and fitted out for the premier trade of the world. The reputation of Boston builders was worldwide. they built for Britain as well as United States.

In that prosperity they had the natural outgrowth of existing conditions; nothing short of a change of condition could destroy that prosperity.

Now here is a statement of one of the greatest marine authorities on the lakes, Harvey D. Goulder, of Cleveland. Harvey D. Goulder observes:

After a line once meets with success it goes on from great to greater. The cost in England is about the same as in the United States for boats for the lakes where standardizing is in vogue. One yard builds passenger ships and can build cheaper than anywhere else because of specialization. The cost of moving a ton of freight on the lakes is eight-tenths of a mill per thousand, probably one-fifth of the cheapest cost on the most favored railroad. Hatches are constructed to suit unloading machinery, and floors are specially designed to help steam shovels.

The protection of the United States navigation laws made the United States shipping on the lakes 98 per cent., while only two per cent. goes to Canada, but the United States on the ocean carries only eight and a half per cent. of its own produce. Mr. Goulder stated:

Canada by reason of great development of her resources is growing up commendably, wonderfully, splendidly, and we are not jealous, and we are not envious.

Let no man be afraid of extending conservatively, wisely as it is given to human wisdom to do, beneficent aid and protection to our merchant marine.

Well, sir, I expect to see the Georgian Bay canal built before I die, I expect to see a railway built connecting with the navigation of the Hudson's Bay. I expect within ten years to see the depth of the Welland canal increased to twenty feet, and I say that we will have traffic in Canada for all these great water ways. The traffic on the Welland canal at the present time is, of products of the forest 14 per cent., of the farm 50 per cent., and of merchandise and manufactures 36 per cent. The greatest benefit we derive from canals is the regulation of railroad rates and in the grain business canals are supreme until closed by ice. The coal on Vancouver Island is superior to all the Pacific coast coal, and it is said that Vancouver Island is entitled to be called the Britain of the North Pacific. We have within 50 miles of Ottawa 917,403 horse power for electricity; there are 700,000 horse power along the Georgian Bay canal; Niagara has 7,000,000 horse power, more than half of it Canadian; the St. Lawrence River has 10,000,000 horse power; the canals of Canada over 20,000,000 horse power, but capable of developing more. Mr. W. Downey when sworn said:

A ship costs \$350,000, 30 per cent. or \$315,000 would be spent on labor from the time of starting to dig coal and iron to hoist of flag. Look at the money spent out of that. We pay \$200,000,000 a year to foreign shipowners for carrying trade to and from the United States. We should make an effort to earn this ourselves and distribute it through all the coal miners, ore miners, mechanics, finally through the sailors and officers of the ships and back to be spent in building other ships.

It is a direct loss to us. We have spent blood and money to develop that foreign commerce.

If money and land are spent to develop railroads, to help the farmer, why should not money be spent on ships to continue the chain?

And, Mr. Speaker, if money and land are spent to develop railroads for the farmer, why should not money be spent on ships to continue the chain of transport and thus **raise the price of grain to the farmers?** On the question of freight rates I may mention that it costs \$4 per thousand to haul lumber 820 miles on the Pacific coast, and \$1.75 to haul it the same distance on the lakes. I will wager that there are small ships on Lake Huron that will carry for 50 cents less; the price generally on the Georgian Bay to Chatham and in that vicinity is from \$1 to 1.25. The freight rate on freight passing through

the Soo in 1899 was 87 cents, which meant a trip every ten days, there being three days terminal detentions. In 1867 it cost \$8 per ton to carry ore and steel rails \$1,000 miles, and in 1904 the same transportation only cost 80 cents. The value of goods increases with every increase of transportation facilities and decrease of rates. It is a remarkable statement which has been verified, that an ordinary cargo vessel sailing on the upper lakes will take to the seaboard quicker than will a freight train. The cost of freight per ton per mile in Great Britain averages \$2.30; on the continent from \$1.90 to \$2.10; in Russia \$1.75, and in the United States 72 cents, notwithstanding the fact that train hands and workmen are better paid in the United States than any where else in the world. There are lower freight rates on the great lakes than in any place in the world, and this has been helped out by human ingenuity. In 1859 it cost 15 75 cents to carry one bushel of corn from Chicago to Buffalo; in 1871 it cost 7.50 cents, and in 1890 it cost 1.88 cents. In 1867 it cost \$4.25 to carry one ton of ore from Escanaba to Erie; in 1870 it cost \$2.50; in 1890 it cost 82 cents, while during part of 1890 it was as low as 55 cents per ton. Mr. E. C. Plummer, of New York, on being sworn deposed:

Fifteen years ago cost 15 cents per bushel grain Duluth to Buffalo. To-day you get it carried 1,000 miles for 1½ cents. Why? United States brains and ingenuity have done it:

Andrew Jackson, in his message to Congress, said:

Any industry which would be of national importance was entitled to be protected if there was any chance it could compete with foreign-

The men who are freighting are making money, as the 800,000 new tons of shipping built in Great Britain yearly shows. The regular liners carry as cheaply as tramps, and they must sail on time, full or not full, and so lose at first until trade is established. At page 432 it was deposed that the cost of carrying grain was cut from 15 cents to one and one-half cents per bushel, which is of course is a great benefit to the farmer, and that a ton of coal could be carried 1,000 miles for about the price you can put it into your basement from the road.

Walter D. Sayle, of Cleveland, said:

Earnings of Britain's fleet are 550,000,000 yearly, or equal to all the earnings of the railways in the United States, or the entire wheat cost of the United States. In 1838 Great Britain had a steam tonnage of 74,684 and the United States, 103,423 tons.

Alex. E. Brown said :

The shipping business depends on the regularity with which you receive and discharge cargoes every day.

On the Atlantic coast, in New York, etc., they are as behind as Europe in handling freight. The general method is 2,000 years old, handling freight by hand.

From \$2 to \$13 per ton was charged in the fall for carrying a ton of ore; the price now is 55 cents.

Labor objected to the first automatic machinery on the lakes, but now approves, as it has placed labor on a much higher plane. The charge of nineteen cents for loading comes out of the freight charge of fifty-five cents to seventy cents per ton. The three cents per ton for trimming is not required on large ships.

With a machine at Conneaut, one man can take out 3,000 tons in ten hours, and put it on cars.

Ore is carried from Sweden to England, 1,000 miles, for \$2.50 per gross ton. The highest rate on the lakes for the same distance is \$1.20 to \$1.25.

The exports in 1904 from Atlantic ports were nine millions, and twenty-four millions from gulf ports.

The traffic is changing from the Atlantic ports to the gulf ports and the Pacific ports. For 20 years up to 1903, New York exported about 27,000,000, but in 1904 New York exported only 3,000,000.

For twenty years to 1903, Baltimore exported about 11,000,000, but in 1904 Baltimore exported only 3,000,000.

From 1899 to 1903 Pacific ports exported from one-sixth to one-third of the total wheat, during 1903 nine-tenths of the total went from the Pacific coast.

Exports of wheat in 1905 were the smallest since 1860, and the total exports of wheat and flour reduced to wheat were the smallest since 1872. This does not necessarily presage a decline in the wheat business. The farm price of wheat in December, 1904, was 92.4 cents per bushel, the highest since December 1, 1888, and the crop harvested in 1904 was by no means a small one. In the fiscal year 1905 Baltimore was the largest. The Atlantic ports shipped only 116,000 bushels. In 1892 the wheat exported was 157,280,351 bushels.

What does that show ? It shows that Canada is going to be the granary of the world, and that we should use our own delivery wagon.

The gulf ports' improved method for handling flour are helping them especially at New Orleans.

Gulf of Mexico has four large grain and cotton ports. The Atlantic has five or six of each.

In wheat, the Atlantic ports carried fifty-nine per cent. from 1884 to 1888; only twenty per cent. in 1904. The gulf ports increased from two to fifty-five per cent. in the same time, but the latter dropped from fifty-five to one per cent. in 1905.

In twenty-two years ending 1905, Atlantic and gulf ports handled eighty-seven to ninety-one per cent. of corn and considerable wheat and flour, but in 1905 only six per cent. of the wheat exported went by Atlantic and gulf ports and ninety-two per cent. by Pacific ports.

From 1904 on, cotton began to be exported from the port nearest to where grown. Railroad competition has reduced the rates on the unimproved canals to starvation almost. A few years since the audacious men who ventured to hope a ton of freight might be carried on long routes for two cents per mile were laughed at and pointed out as radicals and enthusiasts, but they have been left far in the rear, one-sixth of a cent per ton per mile being the rate from Chicago to Boston.

Railroads could not carry the coal and iron, but lakera have cheapened railroad freights.

Ocean vessels generally take freight, high class freight.

Fast liners carry little freight. Most freight is carried in large slow liners with greatest freight capacity.

George Y. Wisner, whom a great many members of this House will know as one of the most efficient civil engineers on the lakes, says :

We have on the great lakes the best conditions in the world for gathering material and labor for ship construction.

A. B. McNairn says :

Cleveland has been a builder of and founded by ships since Moses^d Cleveland first pushed his boats against the bank of the site of the city which bears his name.

H. D. Goulder says :

Without government aid a revival will not be accomplished.

W. S. Sayle says :

Shipbuilding is an industry which consumes a great many products, and furnishes employment to nearly every other industry in the country. For a shipyard revived a hundred correlated industries are stimulated.

Mr. S. Hartman, of Scotland, says :

The building of a ship involves practically every trade and nearly all the materials and manufactures in existence, and there is no industry which needs a greater number of people.

England manufactures ships—you cannot call it building.

The United States has 10,000 miles of sea coast and twenty steel ship-building yards; Great Britain has 1,000 miles of sea coast and 100 shipbuilding yards.

These yards are building tramp steamships cheaper than any other country in the world—not that they get bounties for them, but because they get bounties for the better class of ships, they can build tramp ships cheaper at the same time. The more a man manufactures the cheaper he can do it.

On the great lakes the United States build as cheaply as ships are built on the Ware or the Tyne.

H. C. Calkin said :

Ninety per cent. of the cost of a ship goes in labor. It commences in the forest, on the mine and on the farm, and it winds up with the sweat of the man who puts the finished material together.

Wm. D. Sewell said:

Bath, Maine, has been a shipbuilding centre for 150 years. In 1859, fifty-nine square or full-rigged ships were built there, but in 1904, not one. Our yard was the last to give up. Today it is closed after building over 100 full-rigged ships.

Mr. Smith, New York and Cuba mail lines, said:

We have five ships costing three millions; over eighty per cent of the labour to build them was spent in the United States, because foreigners cannot trade there.

Mr. Smith, president of the Mail Steamship Company, said:

For five years ending December 31, 1903, we spent in the United States on our four steamers, \$397,144.87 to United States workmen.

The United States does not protect ships, but she is going to by a Bill, S—529, now before the United States Congress, brought in by Mr. Gallagher, chairman of the Merchant Marine Shipping Committee. Why can the United States build steel bridges and steam engines in competition with Great Britain, and send them to Africa or Australia or any other country in the world? Because these things are protected, though shipping is not. The United States can put bridges on the Cape to Cairo Railroad cheaper than England can—why? Because the men who build these bridges and these engines are protected. The only unprotected industry in the country, shipping, is going to be protected, by Bill S. 529. And that is what called forth from the London "Times" this statement to which I have referred, that Great Britain is face to face with a very serious problem. Thomas Clyde, of New York, representing the Clyde Line, which is known to many hon. gentlemen present, says, page 10:

Although not absolutely necessary, ships are usually repaired where the owner lives. A vessel costing \$450,000 requires yearly \$12,000 to \$15,000 overhauling.

And at page 16 it is shown that the standardizing of building is the fundamental element of cheap ship-building. British tramp ships are all similar. At page 23 it is stated that the United States beats the world in loading and unloading—a vessel never makes any money when she is at the dock. The combined tonnage on the great lakes is 55,000,000 tons.

Now, here is a point to which I ask special attention. At page 703, C.E. Creamer, of Chicago, says that lake vessels are not a success on the ocean. The vessel is lame and lopsided when she gets back and is glad to be there in any condition.

At page 706, R.H. Ferguson, of Chicago, says that in the past five years, 175 vessels with a combined carrying capacity of 1,000,000 tons, were built on the lakes. The modern laker is 560 feet long, 56 feet beam and 32 feet deep. She will carry 10,000 tons of coal and grain at a depth of 17½ feet. Joseph R. Forde says—page 503—that the United States manufactures and builds and sends bridges, aqueducts, locomotives, engines and agricultural implements all over the world in competition with all others.

At page 578, Wm. F. Humphrey says that in the construction of bridges and locomotives the United States producers have become adepts: continued application makes the hand cunning and the head inventive, and years of experience and experiment reduce construction to a science. Lewis Nixon, marine architect, says that on the great lakes are built the best boats suited to the service for which they are intended—vessels of large dimensions, splendid boats of their kind. And, as they are practically all of one kind, a shipyard can apply all its brains, energy and attention to one kind. He does not believe that the same boats could be built abroad at the same cost—this is an age of specialties. Vessels on the lakes are built quicker and cheaper than elsewhere, all of one type. And F. W. Wood, Baltimore—page 476, speaking of standardizing, asks how could the manufacturer build at the same time a locomotive, a mowing machine and a stationery engine: where would he come out? At page 478 it is stated that it would take 800 men two years to build a ship of 10,500 tons, at a cost of about \$800,000. At page 479 the work of the shipyard is represented as a focus, a head centre: it represents work going on all over the country, in the woods, in the mines, on the farm, in a great many other industries. At page 1146 it is shown that free trade England protects her ships. At page 1148 the transportation business is spoken of as the greatest in the world and labour as the greatest factor in the whole question. At page 1150-1 is a strong argument in favor of paying a bounty, if necessary to the seamen. If each person should pay an infinitesimal amount on account of an enhanced freight, but would receive a greater benefit in a multitude of ways, certainly the individual and general good would be benefited. If, in the body circulation is not equal, suffering is bound to come, and the same with the body commercial. What do we see in Canada with regard to the paying of a bounty? Canada pays in the neighborhood of \$160,000 a year bounty to fishermen. This system began in 1885, and, in five years, instead of having

55,000 fishermen in the maritime provinces we had 77,000. Here is an object lesson for us in our country. At page 871 of the report it is stated that it is a strange thing that a country like the United States, with 10,000 miles of coast line and an export trade of \$1,500,000,000 has no ship engaged in carrying its commerce. A British ship or German ship will work for British or German houses in preference to American. This is shown by our Canadian experience. The vessels that were sold abroad owing to the coming into force of the Plimsoll Act were originally manned by Canadian sailors, but now they are manned by cheap Norwegian sailors who come here, and by the acceptance of lower wages keep our own men out of this class of work. There has been a similar experience in England where vessels have been transferred so as to sail under another flag. Now, we have in Canada, in the lighthouse service, 2,027 men. And who are the men in this service? Are they the sailors? I am not saying a word against hon. gentlemen opposite on this point, because I believe the practice of all governments has been the same. When the sailor gets grey and unfit for this work at sea, why should not he enter the lighthouse service? What else can he do when he leaves the ocean? The nature of his occupation is such that he cannot find employment on shore. It should be a standing rule with governments in this country that men employed in the lighthouse or marine service of the government should be picked from the sailor class. As we have party government, let the party in power pick from among their own men—I would not object to that. At page 1011 of the report I have quoted before me are the figures to which I have referred showing the increase in the number of our fishermen as a result of the bounty given. In 1885 our fishermen numbered 59,483, and in 1902 they numbered 77,801. The fact that these figures appear in this report shows that the Americans are looking into this matter. Our neighbors in the United States are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars investigating the question whether they should build a water-highway from Lake Erie to New York, or from Lake Ontario to New York. They estimate the cost of one at \$200,000,000 and of the other at \$225,000,000.

With the improved facilities for building canals that exist in these days, the cost of these works is greatly reduced, especially if you have a small canal already built. To compete with the American route we may well build the Georgian bay 20 foot and enlarge the Welland canal. But, when you have got that, you are pretty well at the end of your tether, for there

are certain probabilities which have been looked into by the United States that show that this is about the limit for the lakes. But up to that limit, every improvement of this kind decreases freight charges and helps the farmers of Canada, for it is our grain that is going to supply the world.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LEWIS. I have a few more references which I desire to present to the House from the report of the steamship subsidies, 279, House of Commons, 1883, paragraph 37:

British Commissioner Hill, page 1986, maintains sale of British vessels may cause very serious results.

I quote this with reference to the sale of our own vessels to Sweden and Norway, which then come back and take commerce from our Canadian ships:

If purchasers are backed by their governments they may develop new trades which British owners cannot do without assistance. Giffen (1902) 293.

Substitution of British officers and men. Hill (1901) 1986 North German Lloyd bought in 1900 Scottish Oriental and Holts East Indian Ocean Steamships Company. 24 capt., 49 officers and 72 engineers, all replaced.

Paragraph 38.

Sir Geo. Drummond states the great advantage to Canada of fast direct inter-communication.

Sir T. Walpole said: If the British government thought desirable, they would be justified in sending mails to Quebec in place of New York, and he would advise the government to carry out that policy.

One of the most effectual means by which Great Britain, the greatest free trade country on the face of the globe, protects her shipping is by giving large subsidies for the carriage of mails.

Paragraph 50.

That granting of subsidies has favored competition against British ships.

That granting of through bills of lading via state railway and steamship lines has had a great effect to develop trade in Germany.

No British subsidy granted except for conditions that vessel cannot be sold or chartered without consent of the government, and the crew should be British subjects (all officers and part of men).

In 1885 men, 50,493; in 1902 men, 77,801. In 1885, total amount invested in Canadian deep sea fisheries $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions; in 1902, \$11,300,000.

In reference to subsidies and bounties for building ships. Where the ship owner receives a bounty for building, that ship must remain under the flag—until it is wrecked.

Under protection United States marine grew and became a menace to England. Under free and non-protection it went to pieces.

Page 143.

Our industries born, reared, grown to vigorous manhood, but the ship is a foundling denied all shelter.

Why should not a sailor be protected as well as a tin plate roller, etc., etc.

Page 1,113 of the Merchant Marine investigation:

Subsidies lessen as business of line improves.

Report 279 on Subsidies—IX. From German point of view policy of direct and indirect subsidies have been that of a good investment, but element of success is energy and enterprise of recipient.

Page 513:

Success of England, Germany, Japan and other countries lies in regular steamship lines to all practicable trading ports.

Page 539:

The fast up trade and lines soon become paying.

England, though claiming to be a free tariff country, is the greatest protector of any country on earth as to her merchant marine, and the result is she is today mistress of the seas and the marine transportation of the nations.

Page 629:

In 1840 England gave Samuel Cunard £60,000 a year to run two ships a month to Boston and Halifax. Increased soon to £90,000.

See what the result has been. Within the last year England has given to the Cunard Line \$13,000,000 to build two of the finest ships in the world. Originally a ship of the Campania style cost \$3,000,000, then the cost rose to \$5,000,000 for such a ship as the Deutschland of the German Line, and now it takes \$7,000,000 to build a large ocean steamship.

Great Britain pays bounties to fast mails and many thousands of her seamen.

She has over 30,000 seamen who receive from \$30 up to \$100 every year, and she finds it a good investment.

XV. Great Britain began in 1839 or 40 and since then has paid between \$260,000,000 and \$300,000,000 in creating and sustaining lines to every great port and market on planet.

XVI. United States line San Francisco to Asia get \$63,902 per year, 5 steamers.

Japan has for 3 steamers, \$600,000 per year.

Germany pays \$1,340,000 per year to East Indies, Australia, N.G.Lloyd.

Great Britain pays \$1,660,000 to Peninsula and Oriental.

Indirectly: tramps benefit, being built in large shipyards created for the subsidized lines.

Those who are not acquainted with marine phraseology may not know what a 'tramp' steamer is. It is a steamer which does not belong to any line, but it carries freight from port to port wherever it can get business.

F. D Adams, Philadelphia, says:

One of the very first measures George Washington signed was one to give a rebate on duties for goods carried in American ships.

It is impossible to build up our foreign trade without our own ships. One American line to Brazil increased the exports there one million dollars in two years.

But they dropped the subsidies and the line dropped out.

400 millions in China need our machinery, our appliances, our manufactures, etc., etc.

In a United States book termed 'Transportation on the Lakes, 1880,' there are certain references touching this question which I wish to bring before the House. In one of them these words occur:

Influences of a large waterway prevent variations of rates resulting from alternate competition and combination of transportation lines, especially upon bulky freights. The increased demand for a higher class of freight created by the business prosperity which would inevitably follow the construction of a great waterway, would more than compensate the railways for the loss of the low class traffic.

Considered by high authorities very doubtful whether a vessel can be so constructed as to navigate successfully and economically the ocean, the lake and the canal.

Now some experts and engineers may say that is doubtful, but if you go to any man who owns these vessels and has tried the experiment, he will tell you that it is impossible for a lake vessel safely to navigate the ocean. I read about one of these ships that went to the Pacific coast and managed to get round the Horn, but she was lost and no one knows where.

Big canal would make big ship building for ocean on lakes. 1,258 steel vessels built on lakes in 10 years ending 1900. U.S.

Distinguished authority says: 'Life of any public work is practically with that of the generation which began it.' Reason why it is true is because in such construction future necessities are almost invariably underestimated.

The traffic is so great in the three locks at Sault Ste. Marie that the construction of a new lock is under consideration. I may say that the United States Government has set aside \$1,000,000 and has bought land for building a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie canal. Any such work should be of a national, not a local character, benefiting many and varied commercial interests, and exerting its influence over the whole country. Debt incurred by Canada since 1867 for canals (capital account) is \$66,694,740, and for railways (capital account) \$128,534,490. An exhaustive study of relative advantages by the board shows that the benefits from waterways are so well defined that further inquiry would add but little force to the conclusion. A waterway connecting the great lakes with the sea is an instrument of commerce for the purposes of increasing the value of merchandise by transporting it from one side to the other. Comparisons between routes are too narrow and limited if taken from a cost point of view.

Senator Grosvenor says :

You are boasting now of cheapness of freight rates. The primal fact is the size of ships. Each enlargement cheapens the freight and benefits the farmer. Necessities of the people should drive us to sink our differences and join hand in hand.

Now, I am an optimist as to the future of Canada, the lakes are the water arteries of the continent. The Soo has three and a half times the traffic of the Suez canal, the Suez Canal is open all year, the Soo two thirds of the year or less. Thirty-seven years ago 20,000 bushels of corn passed through Welland canal. I have already mentioned the steamer Wolvin as having carried 400,000 bushels in one load. From the St. Lawrence to Lake Superior the distance is 2,382 miles, included in which are 67 miles of canals. Lake Superior is the natural outlet and key to the traffic of the West. Fort William is 828 miles nearer Liverpool, via Montreal than Duluth is via New York. I have here a statement taken from last week's edition of the Canadian Journal of Commerce in regard to freight traffic :

The domestic freight traffic of the Detroit River, covering the season of lake navigation of 1905 shows a total of 53,639,086 net tons of domestic freight. The freight traffic through the canals at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and Ontario during the same period aggregated 44,270,680 net tons, of which 36,774,733 was south-bound. Of these two canals the total freight movement through the United States amounted to 38,800,190 tons, while that through the Canadian canal totalled 5,468,490 tons. During the lake season of 1905 the difference between the amount of freight carried respectively through the Detroit river and the Soo canal amounted to 9,338,408 tons in favor of the former route. The total freight of the Welland canal showing the volume of water traffic be-

tween Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, aggregated in 1903, the last available date, 979,807 tons, of which only 282,213 was up-bound.

Now here is a quotation from an American transportation paper some years ago :

New York and Boston now hold Montreal in check by the Erie canal and Central Railroad. After the enlargement of the canal New York will be obliged to make strenuous efforts to hold its own. Should it fail it will doubtless be its policy to open a ship canal from the St. Lawrence into Lake Champlain and to the Hudson.

Now, that has happened. The grain that was carried through the United States ports in 1905 was 160,000,000 bushels as compared with 127,000,000 bushels, but the Americans are going to build a canal 200 miles in length from Lake Ontario or Lake Erie to the Hudson. As to the value of canals, two centuries since Paterson, who founded the Bank of England and the colony of Darien, wrote thus as to a canal to unite two oceans :

It will be the gate of the universe and enable the proprietors to give law to both oceans.

If the Government of Canada, whoever may be in power, improve the waterways from the head of Lake Superior to the St. Lawrence, they will provide the key that will unlock the traffic route of the whole continent of America. The first canal on this continent was started in Canada, in 1779, completed in 1781 and enlarged in 1804 and in 1817. The first canal at the Soo was built in 1797. The Welland canal was begun in 1824 and finished in 1829. It was enlarged between 1841 and 1850, and deepened in 1873 to 12 feet. In 1887 it was deepened to 14 feet. Since 1821 the Government of Canada has spent upwards of \$80,000,000 on canals. After looking into these matters, talking with a number of experienced men and examining many books, I am firmly convinced that it would take very little over \$10,000,000 to enlarge our canals between Montreal and Lake Huron to an extent sufficient to provide a depth of 20 feet of water. The first suggestion of the construction of the Erie canal was made in 1803. Governor Morris in 1803 regarded it "as an effusion of an eccentric mind." In 1808, \$600 was appropriated to survey a canal from the Hudson to Lake Ontario, and another canal around Niagara. At that time it was proposed to construct a canal around Niagara through the United States. This was deemed impracticable on the ground that freight having once reached Lake Ontario it was cheaper to take it to Montreal

than to New York. That is an argument which is still an important factor in determining the location of a waterway from the lakes to the sea. The United States have spent a large amount of money, they have consulted the most experienced engineers, and they have even gone so far as to get contractors to estimate on the cost of constructing a canal according to the Wilson route from Lake Erie and according to the Olcott route from Lake Ontario. They estimate that a 21-foot canal from Lake Erie will cost \$206,000,000, and that a 30 foot canal will cost \$317,000,000. For divers reasons, principally on account of the influence on the depth of water at the Limekiln crossing, it has been decided that it will be impossible to construct anything more than a 21-foot canal. In 1895 the commissioners reported again as follows :

It is entirely feasible to construct such canals and develop such channels as will be adequate to any scale of navigation that may be desired between the great lakes and the seaboard.

Harper's, 1879-80, page 579, says :

Under the influence of her canal New York outstripped the rival cities of the Atlantic. The progress of the railroad in this country has been gradual but constant, as steel replaced iron and mechanism improved.

It should be noted here that vessels would not suit ocean, lake and canal. Then Harper's proceeds :

Indirect advantages and benefits may result from the establishment of a great transportation line which may be of such importance in their influence upon the production, commerce and general prosperity of the whole people that the question of a greater or less return of direct value may become comparatively insignificant.

One-third of east-bound lake freight is exported to foreign countries, the remainder being distributed to domestic markets. The most strongly marked feature of navigation, both on the ocean and on the great lakes has been the increase in the size of the ships. On the St. Mary's canal, in 1882, out of 4,384 passages the average tonnage was 543; in 1891 it was 862, and 1889 1,146. This does not give an accurate idea of the character of the change, which, while on the whole continuous, has been the greatest when harbors and channels were deepened. Every time you deepen a canal so that vessels can carry two or three hundred tons more, you lessen the freight charges on the railways and you increase the amount that the farmers of Canada will get for their grain. The time of lockage at the Soo is 37 minutes each way, but it is less on the Canadian canal, which is worked by electricity. The Niagara

ship canal, the canal from the lakes to the Atlantic, has been before the public for nearly a century. New York people want it to cross New York to aid in keeping up commercial and financial New York, but Western people want it where it will be handiest for lake traffic. The growth of trade in all the lakes has been steady and rapid. Lake Superior is exceptional, due in a large part to the opening of St. Mary's canal. Gen. Poe says :

For two centuries this brother of the sea, this greatest of all inland seas lay in distant isolation, enfolded by a wilderness, the coming civilization heralded only by the missionary and fur trader coasting along its silent shore.

This is the dictum of a gentleman who had charge of the navigation on the United States side of the lakes: he was as large in mind as he was in body, and he foresaw what the future would bring forth, and had it not been for his efforts they would not have had the last lock at the Soo. The Welland canal up to 1892 cost about \$25,300,000, and up to that date the largest vessels to go through were the whalebacks, 265 feet long, 38 feet beam and 15 foot draft loaded. The report of the Government of the United States says that the total cost of all harbor and river improvements up to the close of 1890 was \$40,912,975, but the saving effected by transportation by lake marine more than pays this back in a single season. I wish to say that the three government vessels that have been built on the lakes, the Vigilant, the Lurcher and the Anticosta, are the best boats that could be built for that purpose. I do not say anything as to their cost, but better boats you could not have. The boats built at Collingwood and other places on the lakes for our merchant marine are better than those built in the old country, because the latter are built as ocean-going vessels and are not suitable for navigation on the lakes. Mr. Speaker, I believe firmly that I have a good case. This is one of the most important matters that has been brought before Parliament in a great many years, and my only fear is that I have not been able to present it to the House as strongly as I should. Had I the eloquence of the Prime Minister combined with the eloquence of my own leader, I am afraid that even then I would fail to put these facts before Parliament with sufficient force. But I have a good case. It reminds me of an incident that occurred when as a young man I used to be on the lakes myself for a while. I wish I had remained there, because I liked the life, and if I had done so I would not be obliged to give up the trust which my constituents have re-

posed in me in case a certain Bill passes which is designed to cut out all we poor men who come to Parliament. Nowadays a vessel makes 23 trips to Lake Superior, but in the olden days a vessel only made 12 trips or 13 at most from Buffalo to Chicago. There was an old owner at Lockport, N. Y., who had a number of vessels that were making money; in those days they got 5 and 6 and 7 cents for grain. This owner noticed at the end of each year that the captain put in each of his trip bills \$2 for a horse to the customs-house. One year the owner went to Chicago on one of his ships called the Moonlight, a noted boat, and he found there was a small customs station right at the wharf and that all the captain had to do was to walk upstairs and enter his boat. However, the owner was making good money and he said nothing about the \$2 charged for a horse. On the way down he said: "Captain, I do not think it is any use to have a horse to go up those stairs." Next season the captain was successful in making fourteen trips, and when he brought in his bill there was no five dollars for a horse to the custom house. The owner remarked this and the captain replied: "Well, boss, the two dollars is there all right, but you don't see it." And so I say I have a good case here, whether or not I have been successful in making gentlemen on both sides of the House see it. We in Canada have our cod fisheries on the Atlantic, our salmon fisheries on the Pacific, our endless forests, our inexhaustible iron deposits, our uncounted acres of the finest wheat land in the world, our coal areas unfathomed in British Columbia and Nova Scotia, and finally the best half of the greatest inland waterway on the globe, which must ever be the channel of a stupendous and constantly increasing commerce. Through the administration of this inheritance more than any other perhaps is the proper destiny of Canada to be achieved. I am reminded of a story told by a German doctor of a capitalist in the West who became ill on a train, and when he asked the doctor what was the matter with him the doctor said: "Well, I cannot tell you until I get you on the table." And when they did get him on the table they found him full of undigested securities. I trust that will not be the case with Canada. We can supply England with grain, and after the Nile cataracts have been dammed, Egypt will give her cotton. No one nation is going to allow itself to be dominated and controlled by any other nation. Here is an extract from one of the highest authorities on marine matters, Froide's "English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century":

Viewed from whatever standpoint we may assume, it is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than that the British merchant marine is not only the greatest British industry, but that for its overwhelming importance and far-reaching effect upon mankind, it is the most stupendous monument of human energy and enterprise that the world has ever seen. Take away her merchant fleet, take away the navy that guards them, her empire will come to an end, her colonies will fall off like leaves from a withered tree, and Great Britain will become an insignificant island in the North Sea, for future students to discuss the fate of, in their debating societies.

This speaks of the navy. I am not discussing this question from a naval point of view. The Beaver and the Maple Leaf are emblems of peace. I am discussing the question from a commercial standpoint, and in that respect nation fights nation for the supremacy of the sea. I trust that this Parliament, on one side and on the other, will bend its energies and bring in legislation to enable Canadians to build Canadian ships to carry Canadian produce, and bring back the freights to be spent in Canada. Canadian ships must be manned by Canadian men and boys. There is more interest in one old wind-jammer that pounds her way from the Bay of Fundy or the St. Lawrence Gulf to Hull, or from Fort Arthur at the western end of Lake Superior down to Kingston, or from Vancouver to Alaska or Honolulu, provided it carries the flag of Canada, than in the proudest liner afloat, if she is a foreigner and is manned by Chinese. Under that flag the hearts at home will go out to the hearts at sea; and in the language of Lord Dufferin, one of the finest men that ever graced the office of Governor General of Canada, as that ship returns from a foreign clime, the girls at home will have hold of the tow rope.

I move that the House do now adjourn.

SOME NEWSPAPER COMMENTS.

West Huron's Member Makes Strong Plea For Lake Marine in House of Commons.

The Mail and Empire, Toronto.

Mr. Lewis had carefully studied the subject, and presented very forcible arguments in its support. He pointed out that notwithstanding the favorable conditions for the development of the industry in Canada, the mercantile marine of the country was decreasing instead of increasing. No question affected the interests of the farmer more than the conditions of the shipping industry, which was one of the chief links between the agricultural producer and his final market. Canada protected everything but the shipping. He insisted that Canadian ships should be built by Canadians, and manned by Canadians. Every dollar expended in the country in shipping would thus be returned to the pockets of the people. (Applause.) Ninety per cent of the cost of a ship was spent in labor. He had a great and abiding faith in his country. Canada possesses the material to make the best seamen in the world, because they had flowing in their veins the blood of the men who had done so much to make the British Empire what it is today. United States Congress now had a Bill before it affecting shipping. This would put Canada in a bad position if we would not do something similar. Hon. Mr. Brodeur, Minister of Marine, complimented Mr. Lewis on his speech.

PLIMSOLL OF HURON

UTTERS ELOQUENT PLEA FOR THE BETTER PRO- TECTION OF CANADIAN SHIPPING AND SEAMEN.

**Plimsoll's Mark—The Water Line or Load Line, Named
For Samuel Plimsoll, the English Philanthropist—
Act Passed in 1876.—This Act Prevented Ships
From Going to Sea in an Unsafe Condition—He
Exposed the Cruelties of the Cattle Ship Trade in
1890.**

The Free Press, London, Ont.

Ottawa, April 5.—(Special.)—An able and exhaustive address upon the topics of better protection to Canadian shipping and Canadian seamen, and the measures which should be

adopted to provide for the growth of the Canadian mercantile marine, was made by Mr. E. N. Lewis, of West Huron, in the House today.

He pointed out that Canada, instead of advancing in importance as befitted a country so richly endowed with the natural adaptable resources, was retrograding as a shipowning country.

On The Great Lakes.

On the great lakes, however, where American shipping was protected, the United States owned the finest class of vessels for the purposes of the trade that existed in the world, yet withal, freight rates upon the staple commodities of commerce and manufacture were lower than in any other part of the globe.

The industry of shipbuilding was one in which the farmer of Canada was particularly interested, not only from the fact that ninety per cent. of the parts of the ship was represented by labor, but also from the fact that increased tonnage meant cheaper rates upon grain over the 2,000 miles of navigation from the head of Lake Superior to tidewater.

The decline of Canadian marine, Mr. Lewis attributed to our policy of free trade in shipping, and we could never hope to become an influential people unless we increased our maritime importance. Japan was an object lesson to the world in that respect.

The trouble in this country, he said, was that while we objected to any but the best class of immigrants, we seemed to think that any crazy old craft, worn out in the service abroad, was good enough to bring here and hazard the lives of our seamen in.

Mr. Lewis paid a high tribute to Canada's seamen. Trained on the fishing banks of the Atlantic or the waters of our own great lakes, they were worthy of every consideration, and, although their services came high, they were worth the money.

Mr. Lewis advocated the application of a load line law to inland shipping, pointing out in this connection that at present foreign ships, not subject to the British load line law, could come to Canadian seaports and take on larger cargoes than Canadian ships of equal tonnage. The remedy was to put Plimsoll's mark on every ship entering a Canadian port for cargo.

In the course of his address Mr. Lewis remarked that the Pacific should be made the Canadian Sea.

Remedy For Overloading.

Kingston Whig.

The marine men, those who sail the ships and those who own them, have a profound interest in the agitation for a load line, distinct and clear, upon all the lake and river carrying craft. The both classes are interested because it means much to them in the salvation of life and property.

The demand for legislation in this connection is not new. It dates back some years, but it has been accentuated by the experience of the last season. Plimsoll was not at first successful in his labor for an English load line, but when he did convince Parliament it acted, and no service since then has been more appreciated.

Special Despatch to The Globe.

Ottawa, April 5.—The danger from which navigation suffers by overloading was impressed on the House today in the course of a three hours' speech by Mr. E. N. Lewis, of West Huron. The speaker had evidently given much study to marine matters, as his speech was marked by a great mass of information.

Mr. Lewis was cheered by both sides of the House when he expressed the hope that he would see the Welland Canal deepened to twenty feet and the Georgian Bay Canal completed.

Mr. Lewis continued this evening, giving further accounts of wrecks from overloading. During his remarks he said:—"I used to be on the lakes, and I wish I had stayed there." When he completed his three hours' address there was loud applause from both sides.

Mr. Brodeur's Reply.

Hon. Mr. Brodeur hoped that the committee would have the benefit of the deep knowledge of Mr. Lewis on the subject.

Ottawa Citizen.

The sitting was marked by the longest speech of the session so far. It was delivered by Mr. Lewis, of West Huron, on the needs of the Canadian mercantile marine, a subject which he has made a life long study.

An able and exhaustive address upon the topics of better protection to Canadian shipping and Canadian seamen, and the measures which should be adopted to promote the growth of the Canadian mercantile marine, was made by Mr. E. N. Lewis,

of West Huron. The industry of shipbuilding was one which interested our farmers particularly, not only from the fact that ninety per cent. of the cost of a ship was represented by labor, but also from the fact that increased tonnage meant cheaper rates upon grain over the two thousand miles of navigation from the head of Lake Superior to tidewater.

Mr. Lewis paid a high tribute to Canada's seamen. They were worthy of every consideration, and although their services came high they were worth the money.

IMPORTANT DISCUSSION ON THE CONDITIONS OF CANADA'S MERCHANT MARINE.

**Its Volume of Business Said to Be Decreasing, Owing
to Lack of Protection.**

Hamilton Spectator.

Ottawa, April 5.—A strong case for protection and encouragement by way of bounty for the Canadian lake marine was made out by E. N. Lewis (Conservative, West Huron) in the Commons today. Mr. Lewis had carefully studied the subject and presented very forcible arguments in its support.

Canada protected everything but her shipping. The United States protected its shipping on the great lakes, and notwithstanding that it paid the highest wages, it carried freight at less rates than anywhere else in the world. Canada had 2384 miles of inland waterways, and these should be covered by Canadian vessels. While United States shipping on the Great Lakes had developed, it had fallen off vastly on salt water. In 1810 the United States had 100,000 tons more of shipping than it has today. In 1838 that country had more shipping than Great Britain. In 1860 our neighbors were close competitors with Great Britain on the world's waterways, carrying 62 per cent. of its own produce at that time. Today the United States marine only carries eight per cent. of the products of that country.

Ninety Per Cent. Labor.

Speaking as a practical mariner, Mr. Lewis declared that in the building of a ship 90 per cent. of the cost was expended in labor. He insisted that Canadian ships should be built by

Canadians and manned by Canadians. Every dollar expended in the country in shipping would thus be returned to the pockets of the people. (Hear, hear.) He had a great and abiding faith in his country. Canada possessed the material to make the best seamen in the world, because they had flowing in their veins the blood of the men who had done so much to make the British Empire what it is today. If the Canadian shipping industry were extended it would be the greatest missionary for expanding our trade. (Hear, hear.) The revival of shipping would benefit the whole country.

The great lakes must be the channel for the constantly increasing traffic, and it was Canada's most important heritage. In view of this it was Canada's duty to foster and encourage the marine industry and all its co-relative industries.

Hon. Mr. Brodeur, Minister of Marine, complimented Mr. Lewis on his excellent speech.

Ottawa Journal.

Mr. Edward N. Lewis, West Huron, moved the adjournment to bring the attention of the Government to the question of the better encouragement of Canadian shipping. Mr. Lewis, who is an old sailor himself as well as a lawyer, is well known as the author of "The Law of Shipping." He spoke for over three hours and argued the while for protection. He wants to see Canadian vessels built in Canada, manned by Canadian seamen, laden with Canadian products, and sailing to and from Canadian ports.

Augustus Wolvin, an American, and one of the greatest marine authorities of that country, had declared that the lake traffic would all turn to the St. Lawrence if Canada would complete the channel. If the Hudson Bay and Georgian Bay canals were both in use for navigation, and the Welland canal were deepened to 20 feet, the marine traffic of Canada would be able to find lots of use for all of them.

Hamilton Times.

Mr. E. N. Lewis brought the attention of the House, in an extended speech, to the position of Canada's merchant marine. While first class vessels were properly inspected and manned, there was no provision for ascertaining the competency of men in command of barges or of the barges themselves being inspected. These craft go out, in the fall of the year especially, very heavily loaded and the lives of the crew are endangered; if for any reason they broke loose or were cut adrift the crew

often could not help themselves. There was great need for the adoption of a "load line," which would protect the crews from the greed of a grasping monopoly, which sent them out on overloaded vessels. He quoted a number of cases where vessels had been lost because of undermanning and overloading.

The Montreal Herald of April 6.

Mr. Lewis quoted authorities to show the value of improved canals and waterways as a means of reducing the cost of transportation, and so increasing the price to the farmer of his produce and promoting trade generally. Mr. Lewis sat down amid applause and was complimented by Hon. Mr. Brodeur on his very interesting address.

The Halifax Chronicle.

It is, we submit, incumbent upon the Government to frame and enforce such regulations as will compel the employment of seaworthy barges, properly equipped with appliances for the protection and saving of life.

The Plimsoll Law provoked violent opposition at first, but it is now accepted as a salutary and reasonable enactment. Canada should not be less vigilant in providing safeguards for her sailors.

Montreal Daily Herald, April 7.

The Canadian House of Commons has just listened to a highly interesting plea put forward for the expansion of the Canadian marine.

The Victorian Daily Colonist, B. C.

Mr. Lewis regards shipping as one of the two great arms of commerce, and he makes out a strong case in behalf of building up in every way our shipping interests.

Huron Expositor.

The member for West Huron spoke for over three hours on his favorite subject, "The Mercantile Marine of Canada." The subject is an important one, and the speech shows deep research and laborious study, and proves him to be thoroughly conversant with the subject, and he gave the House and the country a good deal of valuable information.

The Toronto Star.

His purpose was laudable, and he pointed out the fact that Canadian shipping had dwindled almost to nothing, and quoted a hundred good authorities to show that a good shipping is a might valuable asset to the country.

Clinton News-Record.

Mr. Lewis, West Huron, brought up the important matter of "The Merchant Marine of Canada." He insisted that Canadian ships should be built by Canadians and manned by Canadians. Every dollar expended in the country in shipping would thus be returned to the pockets of the people. (Hear, hear.) He had a great and abiding faith in his country.